EDITOR'S NOTE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

87-299

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 21 1987
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1987

DONNA CROOKS and BRENDA HOLMES,
Petitioners,

vs.

HONORABLE JOHN H. MAYNARD,
Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

William J. Tway
Attorney of Record
TWAY LAW FIRM
P. O. Box 1457
Boise, Idaho 83701
Telephone: (208) 343-6646

Anton Hohler
TWAY LAW FIRM
P. O. Box 1457
Boise, Idaho 83701
Telephone: (208) 343-6646

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1987

DONNA CROOKS and BRENDA HOLMES,
Petitioners,

vs.

HONORABLE JOHN H. MAYNARD,
Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

William J. Tway
Attorney of Record
TWAY LAW FIRM
P. O. Box 1457
Boise, Idaho 83701
Telephone: (208) 343-6446

Anton Hohler
TWAY LAW FIRM
P. O. Box 1457
Boise, Idaho 83701
Telephone: (208) 343-6446

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

I

Does a judge have immunity for an action under 1983 U.S.C. when he invokes, on his own initiative, the contempt power of the court against the clerk of the court and her assistant for the violation of an administrative order when they are not before him in any regular legal proceeding, when the facts on their face show there was no violation, when there has been no hearing, and the contempt is ordered outside of the courtroom and chambers.

II

Does a judge have civil immunity from an action under 42-1983 U.S.C. for the illegal use of contempt powers to punish an alleged disobedience of an administrative order when the judge has no jurisdiction to enter the order as a court but has authority as an administrative judge to make such an order.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented for Review	1
Table of Contents	2
Table of Authorities	3
Opinion Below	4
Basis for Jurisdiction	4
Constitutional Provisions and Statutes	5
Statement of the Case	5
Argument	10
Conclusion	23
Signature Page	23a
Certificate of Service	23b
Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Crooks v. Maynard	51
Opinion and Order of the United States District Court for the District of Idaho in Crooks v. Maynard	42
Art. 5, Sec. 20, Idaho Constitution	42
Section 1-705 Idaho Code	42
Section 1-907 Idaho Code	43
Section 1-1001 Idaho Code	45
Section 1-1603 Idaho Code	45
Section 7-603 Idaho Code	47
Art. 18, Sec. 6, Idaho Constitution	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Forrester v. White, 792 F2d 647,
(7th Cir. 1986).....21
Harper v. Merckle, 638 F2d 848,
(5th Cir. 1981).....16,19
Laskowski v. Mears, 500 f. Supp. 1568,
(N.D.Ind. 1985).....18
McAlester v. Brown, 469 F2d 1280,
(5th Cir. 1972).....16
McMillan v. Svetanoff, 793 F2d 149,
(7th Cir.1986).....18,19,20

CONSTITUTIONS

Constitution of the State of Idaho,
Art. 18, Sec. 6.....6
Constitution of the State of Idaho,
Art. 5, Sec. 20.....13

STATUTES

Section 42-1983 U.S.C.....11
Section 1-907 Idaho Code.....11,14
Section 1-705.1 Idaho Code.....13
Section 7-603 Idaho Code.....13
Section 1-1603 Idaho Code.....13

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion delivered by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, filed June 24, 1987, is set out in full in the appendix, p. 25. The opinion and order of the district court is set out in the appendix, p. 37, and was filed February 26, 1986.

BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this court is invoked on the ground that the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in this case conflicts with decisions involving judicial immunity of state judges of the Courts of Appeals for the Fifth and Seventh Circuits.

(1) The original order for Summary Judgment by the District Court for the District of Idaho was dated February, 26, 1986, and entered on the same day. It was affirmed by an Opinion and Order of the Court of Appeals for the

Ninth Circuit on June 24, 1987.

(2) No rehearing in this case was sought or granted.

(3) The statutory provision believed to confer on this court jurisdiction to review the judgment in question by Writ of Certiorari is 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1) which reads as follows:

> "Cases in the Courts of Appeal my be reviewed by the Supreme Court by the following methods:
>
> (1) by Writ of Certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal case, before or after rendition of judgment or decree;"

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES

The constitutional provisions and statutes involved in this case are lengthy and therefore their pertinent text is set forth in the appendix.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This statement of facts will be supported wherever possible by references to the Excerpts of Record filed with the

Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Part of this record consists of testimony of both petitioner, Donna Crooks, and respondent, Honorable John H. Maynard, as set forth in the Excerpts of Record, pp. 61-75. More testimony of the respondent, the Honorable John Maynard, is set forth in a depostion taken by appellants and is set forth in the Excerpts of Record, pp. 76-77.

Petitioner, Donna Crooks, was appointed to the office of the Nez Perce County (Idaho) Auditor and Recorder and Clerk of the District Court after the former clerk retired. Excerpts of Record, p. 68 l. 21, p. 69 l. 7. Normally this is an elective office. Constitution of the State of Idaho, Article 18, Sec. 6. App. p. 48. After she took office, she hired petitioner, Brenda Holmes, to help with the coordination and the evaluation of the duties of the deputy clerks in the

district court. Excerpts of Record, p. 70 ls. 23-25. She was not hired as a deputy clerk. Excerpts of Record, p.71 ls. 1-4. After a confrontation with the then deputy chief clerk, Julie Palermo, respondent issued an administrative order. Excerpts of Record, p. 71 ls. 9-15. The order, Excerpts of Record, p. 23, stated, in pertinent part:

> "that the newly appointed coordinator (petitioner Brenda Holmes) shall perform no duties connected with the operation of the courts nor shall she interfere with the manner that the deputy clerks perform their duties."

The day after the delivery of the order to petitioner Crooks, she called respondent in an effort to discuss the matter but was rebuffed. Excerpts of Record, p. 72 ls. 1-7.

The clerks' office along with the courtroom and judges' chambers were on the second floor of the courthouse. The

offices for the recorder and auditor were on the first floor. On the day subsequent to the delivery of the administrative order the Chief Deputy, Julie Palermo, came down to the auditor's office to bring some bonding money and was asked some questions by petitioner Crooks. Immediatley upon the return of the deputy to the clerks' office petitioner Crooks was called by respondent and told that if she had any further conferences with any of the deputy clerks he would hold both she and petitioner Holmes in contempt of court. Excerpts of Record, p. 72 l.17, p. 73 l.4.

On the following day both petitioners went up to the second floor into a small room outside of the district court clerks' area to see if a computer could be installed in that room off the civil desk. They were checking for

electrical outlets on the wall and possible places for locations of computer terminals. Excerpts of Record, p.73 l.17-25. They were not disturbing or interfering with the clerks in the clerks' office. Excerpts of Record, p.74 ls. 1-4.

At that point one of the magistrates came out of his office and told them to leave the second floor as they were not supposed to be there. When they refused to do so, he called respondent to come out there. Respondent then ordered them to leave and when they refused to do so, called the sheriff and told him to take them to jail, which he did. Excerpts of Record, p.74 l.5- p.75 l. 17.

Later, on the 25th day of April, 1986, Judge Maynard issued an Order entitled "In the Matter of the Contempt of Donna Crooks and Brenda Holmes", in

which he stated that petitioners were disrupting the activities of the Deputy clerks. Excerpts of Record, p. 12. This was denied by petitioner Crooks. Excerpts of Record, p. 74, ls. 1-4.

Petitioners were released by order of the Idaho Supreme Court on the following day. Excerpts of Record, p.75 ls. 18, 19.

This civil rights proceeding was then initiated in the District Court for the District of Idaho pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1983.

ARGUMENT

This petition for Writ of Certiorari is based on Rule 17.1(a) of the Rules of the Supreme Court in that the decision rendered by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in this case is in conflict with the decision of another Federal Court of Appeals on the same matter. The issue in question is the

immunity of a state judge for his actions under Section 42 - 1983 U.S.C.

In this case the judge, in his capacity as the administrative judge of the judicial district in which he sat, issued an order under Section 1-907, Idaho Code, (App.p 43) in which he stated that the clerk of the district court had hired a person to coordinate the duties of the deputy clerks working with the courts and that such appointment was made without the knowledge of the administrative judge and also that no judge had had the opportunity to appraise the qualifications or integrity of the person. He then ordered that the said coordinator should perform no duties connected with the operations of the court or interfere with the manner in which the deputy clerks performed their duties (Excerpts of Record p.11). The so called coordinator was petitioner Brenda

Holmes. The full title of petitioner Donna Crooks was "Auditor, Recorder and Clerk of the District Court". Her duties as auditor and recorder were performed in an office on the first floor of the courthouse but the office of clerk of the district court was on the second floor. After the issuance of the administrative order by the judge, petitioner Crooks, who had been instructed to install a computer in the clerks' office, went along with petitioner Holmes to the second floor in a room adjacent to the clerks' office to investigate electrical outlets and other features for the installation of the computer. Excerpts of Record, p. 13, l. 17, p. 74, l. 4. This in no way violated the judge's administrative order. Nevertheless, a magistrate came out, ordered both Crooks and Holmes off the floor entirely, and when they refused to go, brought out the

judge, respondent Honorable John H. Maynard, who also ordered them to leave, and when they did not declared them in contempt and had them incarcerated in the county jail where they remained until released under a Writ of Habeas Corpus by the Idaho Supreme Court.

Under Idaho law the district court has original jurisdiction in all cases, both at law and in equity. Constitution of the State of Idaho, Article V, Section 20, appendix, p. 42. Also, by statute, the district court has original jurisdiction in all cases and proceedings. Idaho Code, Section 1-705.1, appendix, p. 42. The court has the powers for contempt under Section 7-603, Idaho Code, appendix, p. 47, and has powers to enforce order in the proceedings before it under Section 1-1603, of the Idaho Code, appendix, p. 57. We note that all of these statutes refer

to powers of the court as such. These statutes also all refer to some proceeding or case before it in its official capacity. However Section 1-907, appendix, p. 56, which gives powers to the administrative judge, refers only to the judge and refers only to the powers to be exercised outside of his scope as the presiding officer of a court of law.

The question then becomes: does the judge under these statutes have the power to declare in contempt some one who is not before him in the courtroom or his chambers, who has never been brought before him in an adversary proceeding of any kind, who has had no hearing and who is merely pursuing the duties assigned to her by constitution and statutes or by her employer, and when complying with a written administrative order?

Under these circumstances the ninth

circuit held that Judge Maynard was acting in a judicial capapcity. To be sure, the clerk of the district court is part of the judicial system. Her position requires that she follow the orders of the court when they involve the disposition of cases as they flow thru the court system. However, the events which form the basis of this controversary had nothing to do with the official duties of the judge sitting as a court or even in his position as the administrative judge. The clerk and her employee were merely investigating an area for future use of the clerks office, which area was public or at least, as Judge Maynard himself admits, "quasi-public". Excerpts of Record, p. 77, ls. 24, 25.

The facts of this situation are not, so far as we have been able to find, readily duplicated. Yet several cases

present factual situations where judicial immunity has been denied and which throws some light on the issue of judicial immunity. In the case of Harper v. Merckle, 638 F.2d 848 (5th cir. 1981), the court quoting from McAlester v. Brown, 469 F.2d 1280 (5th cir. 1972), set out the facts necessary to establish a judicial act. They are as follows:

> (1)The precise act complained of, use of the contempt power, is a normal judicial function;
> (2)The events involved occurred in the judge's chambers;
> (3)The controversary centered around a case then pending before the judge;
> (4)The confrontation arose directly and immediately out of a visit to the judge in his official capacity.

In this case, only the first of these four factors are present; the use of the contempt power is a normal judicial function. But, the events did not occur in the judge's chambers, the controversary did not center around a case then pending before the judge and

there was no visit to the judge in his official capacity. In fact there was no visit to the judge at all. The court in analyzing these factors concluded that the first two were present but because the last two were not, there was liability. To be sure the court did "caution that our holding is exceedingly narrow and is tailored to this, the rarest of factual settings." The court stated:

> "Succinctly stated, we hold only that when it is beyond reasonable dispute that a judge has acted out of personal motivation and has used his judicial office as an offensive weapon to vindicate personal objectives, and it further appears certain that no party has invoked the judicial machinery for any purpose at all, then the judge's actions do not amount to "judicial acts. " These nonjudicial acts, to state the obvious, are not cloaked with judicial immunity from suit under Section 1983."

Judge Merckle in that case had

involved himself in a child support matter between Harper and his exwife. In a more recent case, McMillan v. Svetanoff, 793 F.2d 149, (7th Cir. 1986), the plaintiff was a court reporter who had been fired by the judge and the claim was that she was discharged because she was black. The district judge denied a motion for summary judgment on the grounds of absolute judicial immunity. In affirming the court said:

> "The rationale for a doctrine that excludes judges from liability for even intentional and malicious conduct while on the bench is that judges should be free to make controversial decisions and act upon their convictions without fear of personal liability. (citation omitted) It is the concern for principled and fearless decision making which forms the basis for judicial immunity."

The court then referred to the case of Laskowski v. Mears, 600 F.Supp. 1568 (N.D. Ind. 1985) and noted with approval that that case held "the protections of

judicial immunity are not for the benefit of a malicious or discriminating judge, but rather for the benefit of the public and that the doctrine should be limited to its central purpose, . . ."

The judge in the case at bar as the judges in McMillan v. Svetanoff, Supra and in Harper v. Merckle, Supra, was acting in a purely administrative, nonjudicial, capacity. No judge sitting on the bench in any legally initiated adversary proceeding need feel any apprehension of liability by reason of a determination of liability on the part of the judge in this case.

In analyzing these cases we submit that the conduct of John Maynard in this case was fully as outrageous as was the conduct of Judge Merckle in the case of Harper v. Merckle, Supra. It may be conceded that one distinction between the two cases is that in the case at bar the

petitioners were employees of the court system while in the Harper case the injured party was acting in a completely private capacity. But it also true that in both of these cases the judges were acting completely outside the jurisdiction of their offices. The distinction between McMillan v. Svetanoff, Supra, and this case is that in McMillan the plaintiff was discharged from her employment while in the case at bar they were thrown in jail. In McMillan a statute provided that court personnel serve at the pleasure of the senior judge of each division who, in this case, was the superior of the judge who terminated the plaintiff's employment. While in the case at bar, the judge had no control over the employment of the clerk or her assistant, so he tried to use other measures to enforce his will. We would submit that

the jurisdiction of the judge is more questionable in the instant case than it was in McMillan. Dismissal was also the basis for a Section 1983 action in the case of Forrester v. White, 792 F.2d 647 (7th Cir. 1986), cert. granted 107 S.Ct. 1282 (1987) where a probation officer was dismissed allegedly on the basis of sex discrimination. The court there felt that the question of subject-matter jurisdiction made little sense since the plaintiff's claim did not arise directly out of litigation before the court. Therefore it held that the connection between the duties of a probation officer and the judge, "were inextricably tied to discretionary decisions that have consistently been considered judicial acts". Such a connection did not exist between petitioners and respondent at the time the acts which prompted this lawsuit were carried out.

As Judge Posner said in dissent:

> "The proper question is whether the decision was made in the judge's judicial capacity. Judges have both judicial and executive jurisdictions."

The order which Judge Maynard issued was purely an administrative order. The judge himself admitted it was an administrative order. Nowhere in the statutes is the administrative judge authorized to utilize his judicial power to enforce an administrative order. But the situation is even more serious than that. The petitioners were not in any way disobeying the administrative order. They were there, in an area, which the judge himself designated as quasi-public and in no way doing anything to interfere with the deputy clerks that were handling the courts business. They were simply looking around an empty room. No matter how one looks at it, the judge could not possibly have had jurisdiction to hold

petitioners in contempt nor did he even have the power, under his own pronouncements, to declare them in violation of any order he made and utilize the contempt power of the court to have petitioners incarcerated. The acts of Judge Maynard in this case, can only be characterized as outrageous and the granting of judicial immunity and the denial of relief to petitioners, raises another question as to the limits of judicial immunity which should be resolved.

CONCLUSION

We believe that the decision in this case is in direct conflict with the decisions cited from the United States Courts of Appeals from the Fifth and Seventh Circuits, and we therefore respectfully request that Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals be granted.

DATED This _____ day of August, 1987.

TWAY LAW FIRM

_____
William J. Tway of the firm
Attorney for the Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 21st day of August, 1987, three (3) copies of this PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT were delivered to the following parties, which constitute all parties required to be served:

Brian K. Julian
QUANE, SMITH, HOWARD & HULL
P. O. Box 1457
Boise, Idaho 83701

Attorney for the Defendant

_____

William J. Tway
TWAY LAW FIRM

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

DONNA CROOKS, Plaintiff,	) CIV. NO.85-3074) (consolidated with) 85-3079)
v.	)
Hon. John H. Maynard, Defendant.	) MEMORANDUM) OPINION AND) ORDER

1. INTRODUCTION

Donna Crooks and Brenda Holmes each filed an action against Idaho Second District Judge John Maynard, alleging Judge Maynard violated rights afforded them by the United States Constitution and asserted under 48 U.S.C. Sec. 1983. A single incident occurring in the Second District Courthouse precipitated both complaints, and on Judge Maynard's motion, the court entered an order consolidating the two cases.

Judge Maynard brings this Motion for Summary Judgment on the sole grounds that the doctrine of absolute judicial immunity insulates him from liability to

either plaintiff. The court heard oral argument on defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment on February 19, 1986.

II. FACTS

On February 19, 1986, the parties filed a Stipulation of Undisputed Facts. Although there are disputed facts, all facts material to the court's disposition of Judge Maynard's Motion for Summary Judgment are undisputed and found in either the parties' stipulation for documents of record.

The Honorable John H. Maynard is a duly elected district judge for the Second Judicial District of the State of Idaho. Judge Maynard also serves as Administrative District Judge of that district. Donna Crooks became the duly appointed clerk of the district court and ex officio auditor and recorder for the County of Nez Perce, Idaho, in April 1985.

On April 23, 1985, Judge Maynard issued an administrative order preventing the newly appointed coordinator (Plaintiff Holmes) from performing any duties connected with the operation of the courts or interfere with the manner that the deputy clerks perform their duties. Crooks received a copy of this order on April 23, 1985.

On April 25, 1985, Crooks and Holmes went to the second floor of the Nez Perce County Courthouse where they were confronted by Magistrate Perry holding a copy of the April 23, 1985, administrative order. Judge Maynard subsequently came to the area and ordered Crooks and Holmes off the second floor of the courthouse. Judge Maynard informed the plaintiffs that they would be held in contempt if they did not leave the area. Neither Crooks nor Holmes would leave the floor of the courthouse.

Judge Maynard then gave Crooks and Holmes ten seconds to leave the area, after which he ordered the sheriff to take them to jail. On the same day, a written document entitled, "In the Matter of the Contempt of Donna Crooks and Brenda Holmes," was prepared and filed by Judge Maynard. This document recited Judge Maynard's view of the confrontation which had occurred on the second floor of the courthouse, and provided that shortly after the confrontation Judge Maynard had advised the jailer that as soon as either or both Crooks and Holmes announced that they would obey the administrative order, they should be brought before Judge Maynard for release.

III. DISCUSSION

This matter comes before the court on defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. The defendant is entitled to judgment only if it appears from the

record that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the defendant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.[1]

Judge Maynard contends his actions were judicial acts taken where there was not a clear absence of jurisdiction, and therefore, he is insulated from liability by the doctrine of absolute judicial immunity. The plaintiffs, on the other hand, assert Judge Maynard's acts were administrative or ministerial and, therefore, were not judicial acts. Plaintiffs argue further that even if Judge Maynard's acts can be considered judicial acts, they were performed in the clear absence of jurisdiction.

---

1 The Complaints seeks both injunctive relief and damages. Plaintiffs conceded at oral argument that because an action seeking injunctive relief is currently pending before the Idaho Supreme Court, plaintiffs are no longer seeking injunctive relief in this action.

The general rule is well established.

> Our jurisprudence has long recognized that "a general principle of the highest importance to the proper administration of justice [is] that a judicial officer [should] be free to act upon his own convictions, without apprehension of personal consequences to himself." ... Though judicial prerogative is broad, two rules circumscribe it. First, the immunity covers only those acts which are "judicial" in nature....Second, "[a] judge will not be deprived of immunity because the action he took was in error, was done maliciously, or was in excess of his authority; rather, he will be subject to liability only when he acted in the 'clear absence of all jurisdiction.'"

O'Neil v. City of Lake Oswego, 642 F.2d 367, 369 (9th Cir. 1981) (citations omitted). Consequently, if the acts complained of were not "judicial acts," or were taken in the clear absence of all

jurisdiction, immunity will not attach.

Factually, this case must be dealt with in two parts. The first involves Judge Maynards' finding of contempt and summary punishment therefore. The second involves the issuance of the administrative order.

A. Finding of Contempt and Punishment Therefor

The Complaint contains three causes of action stemming from Judge Maynard's ordering the plaintiffs jailed: first, "imprisonment without due process of law"; second, "denial of their right to freedom from arrest except upon probable cause"; and third, by "violation of her right to be informed of the true nature and cause of the accusation against her, guaranteed by the sixth amendment."

Traditionally, courts have had the inherent power to summarily punish

contempt committed in their presence. Further, Idaho Code, Sec. 7-603 provides: "When a contempt is committed in the immediate view and presence of the court, or judge at chambers, it may be punished summarily." Idaho Code Sec. 7-601 provides,

> The following acts or omissions in respect to a court of justice, or proceedings therein, are contempts of the authority of the court:
>
> . . . .
>
> 3. Misbehavior in office or other wilful neglect or violation of duty by an attorney, counsel, clerk, sheriff, coroner or other person appointed or elected to perform a judicial or ministerial service.

(emphasis added) The Plaintiffs' failure to comply with the administrative order falls within the broad category of "misbehavior in office" (Crooks as the clerk and Holmes as another person appointed to perform ministerial service)

subject to summary contempt under Idaho Code Sections 7-601 and 7-603. In light of the statutory provisions and the court's inherent power to summarily punish contempt committed in its presence, ~~the~~ court finds Judge Maynard did not act in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.

Similarly, Judge Maynard's acts finding contempt and punishing for that contempt were judicial acts. The Supreme Court has formulated two factors which determine whether an act performed by a judge is a 'judicial act.' An act is a judicial act if it involves a function normally performed by a judge, and second, if the parties intended or expected to deal with the judge in his judicial capacity. Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 362 (1978).

There is little doubt that finding and punishing contempt is a

function normally performed by a judge. However, plaintiffs contend they were not dealing with Judge Maynard in his judicial capacity at the time of the confrontation on April 25, 1985. Plaintiffs reach this conclusion on the grounds that Judge Maynard was without authority to issue or enforce through contempt the previously entered administrative order.

It is clear from the allegations of the Complaints, as well as the affidavits of Plaintiff Crooks, that Crooks and Holmes were challenging Judge Maynard's authority to enter and enforce the administrative order when they refused to leave the second floor of the courthouse. Their refusal also defied Judge Maynard's authority to order them off the second floor of the courthouse as a means of enforcing the administrative order. A person who openly challenges or

confronts a judge's authority to enter and enforce a court order is dealing with the judge in his judicial capacity.[2]

Consequently, the two "exceptions" to absolute judicial immunity are not present with regard to Judge Maynard's finding contempt and summarily punishing that contempt. Judge Maynard is absolutely immune from liability for those acts.

Finally, this result is consistent with the underlying purpose of judicial immunity. A judge should "be free to act upon his own convictions, without apprehension of personal consequences to himself." Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. at

---

2The case might be different if Judge Maynard had not issued an administra-tive order prior to the confrontation. If no attempt was made to cloak his actions with judicial authority, Judge Maynard may not have been acting strictly as an employer. However, such is not the case. Judge Maynard did cloak his actions with judicial authority, and the plaintiffs challenged that judicial authority. Plaintiffs cannot now claim they were not dealing with Judge Maynard in his judi-cial capacity.

355 (quoting Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall 335, 347, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872). Judge Mahan more critically and narrowly describes the purpose of the doctrine:

> Common-law immunities extend only so far as the interests of the common good demand protection for the holder of the office from liability for carrying out his official functions. The application of the doctrine of judicial immunity is restricted to its single objective of protecting judicial freedom in the process of deciding civil and criminal cases. Where the initiative and independence of the judiciary is not effectively impaired, the doctrine of judicial immunity does not hold.

Laskowski v. Mears, 600 F.Supp. 1568, 1574 (N.D.Ind. 1985) (quoting Shore v. Howard, 414 F.Supp. 379, 385 (N.D.Tex.1976)). Obviously, Judge Maynard felt disobedience of his written administrative order and his oral order that Crooks leave the building warranted

summary contempt. Therefore, protecting his action is necessary to avoid impairment of the initiative and independence of the judiciary. This is not to say that the action of Judge Maynard in imposing a jail sentence for disobeying an order directed toward only ministerial activities, without the barest essentials of due process, can be condoned. Such draconian measures hardly further the interest of justice. However, it is clear that immunity will attach to summary contempt proeedings even though the judge's conduct constitutes the most egregious disregard of basic procedural requirements. O'Neil v. City of Lake Oswego, 642 F.2d 367 (9th Cir. 1981); Mcalester v. Brown, 469 F.2d 1280 (5th Cir. 1972).

B. The Administrative Order

The plaintiff complains that Judge Maynard's written administrative

order, as well as his verbal attempts to direct Crooks' work as clerk, was a "usurpation" of her constitutional office.[3] There is a split of opinion on the question of whether a judge acting as an employer or personnel supervisor acts in his judicial capacity for purposes of immunity or simply in an administrative or ministerial capacity like any other employer or supervisor. While the question is an interesting one, and the case of Laskowski v. Mears, 600 F.Supp. 1568 (N.D.Ind. 1985), provides an

---

3 Crooks also complains that she was denied her first amendment rights of association and free speech and her personal rights reserved and retained under the ninth and tenth amendments. The allegations of the Complaint fail to demonstrate how the ninth and tenth amendment rights might pertain to Judge Maynard's actions--the ninth amendment simply provides that the enumerated constitutional rights shall not be construed to deny other rights retained by the people, and the tenth amendment provides only that the powers not delegated to the United States are reserved by the states. As to the

(Cont. on next page)

excellent discussion of the issue (and a persuasively reached conclusion that immunity does not apply), the court need not resolve the issue to dispose of the pending Motion for Summary Judgment. There is simply no constitutional or statutory deprivation alleged to have resulted from Judge Maynard's administrative order.

Paragraph XIX of Crooks' Complaint states the acts of Judge Maynard:

> deprived the plaintiff of privileges and immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States in the following particulars:
>
> 1. By usurpation of her constitutional

---

first amendment, the court can only surmise that somehow Crooks and Holmes are complaining that Judge Maynard's orders prevented them from associating with other court personnel. Absent factual allegations demonstrating Judge Maynard's actions prevented the plaintiffs from freely associating with other persons or exercising their rights of free speech, those claims

> office, which deprived her of the due process right to have the defendant, acting under color of state office, observe the Constitution and laws of the State of Idaho.

This is, at best, a novel claim. The court is unaware of a federal constitutional due process right which requires a state judge to observe the constitution and the laws of the State of Idaho. While it may be true that Judge Maynard could violate the constitution or the laws of the State of Idaho, and therefore be exposed to liability, federal due process does not inherently require compliance with either the constitution or the laws of the State of Idaho.

Crooks and Holmes have not made

---

must be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief might be granted.

out a claim that Judge Maynard's acts of "interfering' with the performance of their jobs implicates federal constitutional or statutory deprivations. Hence, the Complaint fails to state a claim for relief on this grounds, and the court need not address the question of immunity in this regard.

IV. CONCLUSION

Although the contempt was based upon disobedience to an administrative order which may or may not have been a 'judicial act,' the acts of finding contempt and summarily punishing that contempt were judicial acts and were not taken in the clear absence of all jurisdiction. Therefore, Judge Maynard is absolutely immune from liability for those acts.

The plaintiffs have failed to allege facts sufficient to state a claim that there is either a federal

constitutional or statutory deprivation resulting from entry of the administrative orders (both verbal and written) issued by Judge Maynard. Therefore, the Complaint fails to state a claim in this regard and must be dismissed.

V. ORDER

Based upon the foregoing and the court being fully advised in the premises,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment should be, and is hereby, GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all claims of Plaintiff Crooks in Case No CIV 85-3074 and Plaintiff Holmes in Case No. CIV 85-3079 should be, and are hereby, DISMISSED.

DATED this 26 day of February, 1986.

HAROLD L. RYAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Article 5, Section 20

Jurisdiction of district court. - The district court shall have original jurisdiction in all cases, both at law and in equity, and such appellate jurisdiction as may be conferred by law.

IDAHO CODE

1-705 Jurisdiction - Original and appellate. - The district court has original jurisdiction:

1. In all cases and proceedings.

2. In the issuance of writs of mandamus, certiorari, prohibition, habeas corpus and all writs necessary to the exercise of its powers.

3. Its appellate jurisdiction extends to all cases assigned to magistrate's division of the district court; and to all other matters and cases wherein appeal is allowed by law.

1-907. Administrative judge - administrative powers and duties. - The administrative judge or acting administrative judge in each judicial district, subject to the rules of the Supreme Court, shall have administrative supervision and authority over the operation of the district courts and magistrates in the district. These powers and duties include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) arranging schedules and assigning district judges for sessions of district courts;

(b) arranging or supervising the calendaring of matters for trial or hearing;

(c) supervising the clerks of the district courts in the discharge of the clerical functions of the district courts;

(d) assigning matters to magistrates,

and prescribing times and places at which magistrates shall be available for the performance of their duties;

(e) making arrangements with proper authorities for the drawing of civil jury panels and determining which sessions of the district court shall be jury sessions;

(f) arranging for the reporting of civil cases by court reporters or other authorized means;

(g) arranging sessions, to the extent practicable, for the trial of specialized cases, including traffic, domestic relations, and other types of cases, and assigning district judges to preside over these sessions so as to permit maximum practicable specialization by individual judges;

(h) promulgating a schedule of offenses for which magistrates and clerks of court or other designated persons may

accept written appearances, waivers of trial, and pleas of guilty, and establishing a schedule of fines and bails therefor;

(i) assigning magistrates to temporary duty outside the county of their residence, but within the district;

(j) acting as chairman of the district magistrates commission of the district; and,

(k) assigning to other district judges in the district various powers and duties [as] in this act provided. [1969, ch. 102, Sec.1, p.347; am. 1974, ch. 26, Sec. 2, p.804.]

1-1001. Duties of clerk. - The clerk of the district court must perform such duties as are prescribed in the Code of Civil Procedure and in the Penal Code, and such duties as may be required of him by the rules and practice of the court.

1-1603. Powers of court. - Every court

has power:

1. To preserve and enforce order in its immediate presence.

2. To enforce order in the proceedings before it or before a person or persons empowered to conduct a judicial investigation under its authority.

3. To provide for the orderly conduct of proceedings before it or its officers.

4. To compel obedience to its judgements, orders and process, and to the orders of a judge out of court in an action or proceeding pending therein.

5. To control, in furtherance of justice, the conduct of its ministerial officers, and of all other persons in any manner connected with a judicial proceeding before it, in every matter appertaining thereto.

6. To compel the attendance of persons to testify in an action or proceeding pending therein, in the cases and manner

provided in this code.

7. To administer oaths in an action or proceeding pending therein, and in all other cases where it may be necessary in the exercise of its powers and duties.

8. To amend and control its process and orders so as to make them conformable to law and justice.

7-603. Contempt in presence of court. - Punishment. - When a contempt is committed in the immediate view and presence of the court, or judge at chambers, it may be punished summarily; for which an order must be made, reciting the facts as occurring in such immediate view and presence, adjudging that the person proceeded against is thereby guilty of a contempt, and that he be punished as therein prescribed. When the contempt is not committed in the immediate view and presence of the court, or judge at chambers, an affidavit shall

be presented to the court or judge of the facts constituting the contempt, or a statement of the facts by the referees or arbitrators, or other judicial officer. [C.C.P. 1881, Sec. 832; R.S., R.C., & C.L., Sec. 5157; C.S., Sec. 7385; I.C.A., Sec. 13-603.]

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Article 18, Section 6

6. County officers. - The legislature by general and uniform laws shall, commencing with the general election in 1970, provide for the election biennially, in each of the several counties of the state, of county commissioners and a coroner and for the election of sheriff and a county assessor and, a county treasurer, who is ex officio public administrator, every four (4) years in each of the several counties of the state. All taxes shall be collected by the officer of officers

designated by law. The clerk of the district court shall be ex officio auditor and recorder. No other county offices shall be established, but the legislature by general and uniform laws shall provide for such township, precinct and municipal officers as public convenience may require, and shall prescribe their duties, and fix their terms of office. The legislature shall provide for the strict accountability of county, township, precinct and municipal officers for all fees which may be collected by them, and for all public and municipal moneys which may be paid to them, or officially come into their possession. The county commissioners may employ counsel when necessary. The sheriff, county assessor, county treasurer, and ex officio tax collector, auditor and recorder and clerk of the district court shall be empowered by the

county commissioners to appoint such deputies and clerical assistants as the business of their office may require, said deputies and clerical assistants to receive such compensation as may be fixed by the county commissioners.

FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DONNA CROOKS and BRENDA HOLMES, *Petitioners-Appellants,* v. HONORABLE JOHN H. MAYNARD, *Respondent-Appellee.*	No. 86-3629 D.C. No. CV-85-3074 OPINION

Argued and Submitted
March 4, 1987—Portland, Oregon

Filed June 24, 1987

Before: Joseph T. Sneed and Cynthia Holcomb Hall, Circuit Judges, and Albert Lee Stephens, Jr.,* District Judge.

Opinion by Judge Sneed

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Idaho
Harold L. Ryan, District Judge, Presiding

SUMMARY

Civil Rights/Judges

Appeal from a district court's grant of summary judgment based on judicial immunity in a case brought under section 1983. Affirmed.

*Honorable Albert Lee Stephens, Jr., Senior United States District Judge, Central District of California, sitting by designation.

Appellant Donna Crooks was clerk of the district court for an Idaho state district court. She hired appellant Brenda Holmes to assist her in the coordination, organization and evaluation of the deputy clerks.

After learning of Holmes' hiring, Judge John Maynard issued an order limiting Holmes' duties and requiring Crooks to submit a plan whereby working conditions be restored to their former status. Two days after the order was issued, Crooks and Holmes were jailed for contempt of court after refusing to leave the hallway adjacent to the clerk's office. They were released the next day by order of the Idaho Supreme Court. After a writ of prohibition was sought from the state supreme court to restrain the judge from enforcing his order, he rescinded the first order and the contempt order, but the new order also stated that Holmes was not permitted to act as deputy clerk because she was not hired pursuant to established practice.

Crooks filed an amended petition for writ of prohibition restraining enforcement of the final order, and requesting a general injunction prohibiting interference with the operations of the office of clerk of the district court. The Idaho Supreme court denied. Meanwhile a section 1983 civil rights action was filed by the appellants in which Crooks alleged that her constitutional office was usurped, and both Crooks and Holmes alleged they were imprisoned without due process of law, they were denied rights of association and free speech, they were arrested without probable cause, and their right to be informed of the true nature and cause of the accusation against them was violated. The U.S. District Court held that Maynard was protected by absolute judicial immunity and granted summary judgment in his favor.

[1] Judges are immune from damage liability for acts performed in their official capacities. The immunity is absolute, and applies even where a judge acts maliciously. [2] *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349 (1978), established a two part test

for determining whether a judge enjoys absolute immunity from money damages in a suit under section 1983. The initial inquiry is whether the judge dealt with the plaintiff in his judicial capacity (if not he is not absolutely immune) and the second part focuses on whether he was acting in clear absence of all jurisdiction.

[3] In determining whether a particular act is a judicial one two factors must be considered: (1) whether it is a function normally performed by a judge and (2) whether the parties dealt with the judge in his official capacity. [4] Maynard acted in a judicial capacity when he entered and sought to enforce an order that, while directed at what might be perceived to be an administrative problem, was within his power to enter. [5] As to the second part of the *Stump* test, Idaho law gives every court the power to compel obedience of its orders, [6] recognizing an inherent common law contempt power. [7] A judge using his judicial contempt power as a means of enforcing an administrative order aimed at ensuring effectiveness in the operation of the district court, while perhaps not acting wisely, is not acting in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.

COUNSEL

William J. Tway, Anton Hohler, Boise, Idaho, for the petitioners-appellants.

Brian K. Julian, Kathryn A. Sticklen, Boise, Idaho, for the respondent-appellee.

OPINION

SNEED, Circuit Judge:

The plaintiffs, Donna Crooks and Brenda Holmes, brought 42 U.S.C. § 1983 actions against Idaho District Judge John

H. Maynard. The plaintiffs claimed that Judge Maynard violated their constitutional rights to procedural due process by jailing them pursuant to a contempt order. The district court, upon the filing of a stipulation of undisputed facts, found that Judge Maynard was immune from liability and granted summary judgment in his favor. We affirm.

I.

FACTS AND PROCEEDINGS BELOW

At all times relevant to this case, John Maynard was a duly elected district judge for the Second Judicial District of the State of Idaho. Judge Maynard also served as Administrative District Judge (a not unusual but troublesome title nonetheless) of that district. Donna Crooks was the duly appointed clerk of the district court for Nez Perce County. Apparently the troubles began in April 1985 when Crooks hired Brenda Holmes to assist her in the coordination, organization and evaluation of the deputy clerks. Holmes was hired without the knowledge of Judge Maynard and without the opportunity for any judge to appraise her qualifications and integrity. On April 23, 1985, Judge Maynard, after learning of Holmes' hiring, issued an administrative order providing that Holmes "shall perform no duties connected with the operations of the courts nor shall she interfere with the manner that the deputy clerks perform their duties." Excerpt of Record at 11. The order further required that Crooks "submit a plan whereby the working conditions be restored to their former excellent status or in the alternative, withdraw from further interference with the deputy clerks [sic] pursuit of their lawful duties." *Id.*

On April 25, 1985, Crooks and Holmes went to the second floor of the Nez Perce County Courthouse. While they were in the hallway adjacent to the clerk's office, Judge Maynard ordered them to leave the second floor area because they were in violation of his April 23 order. He warned them that they

would be held in contempt if they did not leave. When they refused to leave the area, Judge Maynard ordered the plaintiffs jailed for contempt. They were released the following day by order of the Idaho Supreme Court upon their application for a writ of habeas corpus.

On April 30, 1985, Crooks petitioned the Idaho Supreme Court for a writ of prohibition to restrain Judge Maynard from enforcing the April 23 order, or any like order, and from interfering with the operation of the office of the clerk of the district court for Nez Perce county. On May 15, 1985, Judge Maynard issued another administrative order that rescinded the administrative order of April 23 and the contempt order of April 25. However, the order went on to state that Holmes was not permitted to act as deputy clerk because she was not hired pursuant to the established practice. On July 12, 1985, Crooks filed an amended petition for writ of prohibition requesting that Judge Maynard be restrained from enforcing his orders of April 23 and May 15 and requesting a general injunction prohibiting Judge Maynard from interfering with the operations of the office of the clerk of the district court. The Idaho Supreme Court recently denied the petition for writ of prohibition. *Crooks v. Maynard*, 112 Idaho 312, 732 P.2d 281 (Idaho 1987). The court concluded that the administrative orders of April 23 and May 15 were within Judge Maynard's power and authority under Idaho law. *Id.* at —, 732 P.2d at 288.

Meanwhile, in June 1985, the plaintiffs filed the § 1983 actions in federal district court, the appeals of which are now before us.[1] In her complaint Crooks alleged that 1) her constitutional office was usurped, 2) she was imprisoned without due process of law, 3) she was denied rights of association and free speech, 4) she was arrested without probable cause, and 5) her right to be informed of the true nature and cause of the

[1]The actions were filed separately but were consolidated upon Judge Maynard's motion on August 21, 1986.

accusation against her was violated. Holmes made all of the same claims except the first.

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho found that Judge Maynard was protected by absolute judicial immunity and granted summary judgment in his favor. Crooks and Holmes timely filed this appeal.

II.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

We review a grant of summary judgment de novo. *Ashton v. Cory*, 780 F.2d 816, 818 (9th Cir. 1986). Moreover, the issue of whether a judge is protected by judicial immunity is a question of law reviewable de novo. *See Brewer v. Blackwell*, 692 F.2d 387, 390 (5th Cir. 1982).

III.

DISCUSSION

[1] Not surprisingly, judicial immunity is a subject in which judges are keenly interested. Perhaps cases involving judicial immunity should not be decided by judges. At present, however, there is no escape for judges from this duty. Mass recusals would solve nothing. Therefore, we must determine the validity of Judge Maynard's claim of judicial immunity. We take our cue from the Supreme Court's most recent pronouncement on the subject, *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349 (1978), and our own recent en banc decision in *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793 F.2d 1072 (9th Cir. 1986) (en banc). The long-established common law rule is that judges are immune from damage liability for acts performed in their official capacities. *See Ashelman*, 793 F.2d at 1075. The immunity is absolute; it applies even where a judge acts maliciously. *Stump*, 435 U.S. at 356. In enacting 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Congress did not abrogate the doctrine of absolute judicial immunity. *Id.*

[2] In *Stump*, the Supreme Court established a test of two somewhat overlapping parts for determining whether a judge enjoys absolute immunity from money damages in a suit under § 1983. The initial inquiry is whether the judge dealt with the plaintiff in his judicial capacity, i.e., whether his acts were judicial acts. *Id.* at 362. If not, the judge is not absolutely immune. The second part of the test, assuming the judge was acting in his judicial capacity, is whether he was acting in "clear absence of all jurisdiction." *Id.* at 357. In such case there also is no absolute immunity. The partial overlap occurs because an action "in clear absence of all jurisdiction" very frequently cannot be classified as judicial.

Because the Idaho Supreme Court has already concluded that Judge Maynard acted within his power and authority in entering the April 23 administrative order,[2] *Crooks*, 732 P.2d at 288, the sole issue before us is whether Judge Maynard is immune from liability for holding Crooks and Holmes in contempt for violation of that lawful order.[3] The district court found that the contempt order was a judicial act not done in the clear absence of jurisdiction. It thus ruled that Judge Maynard was immune from suit. We agree.

A. *Judicial Capacity*

[3] In determining whether a particular act is a "judicial" one, we are instructed to consider two factors: (1) "whether it is a function normally performed by a judge," and (2) "whether [the parties] dealt with the judge in his judicial capacity." *Stump*, 435 U.S. at 362. The first factor presents no

[2]The only claim made by Crooks in connection with the administrative order itself was that the issuance of the order usurped her state constitutional office. This claim fails because of the Idaho Supreme Court's holding that the order was proper.

[3]The Idaho Supreme Court specifically declined to address the propriety of Judge Maynard's use of the contempt power, because the issue was moot in the case before it. *Crooks*, 732 P.2d at 288 n.3.

problem. The issuance of a contempt order is undoubtedly a function normally performed by a judge. *See King v. Love*, 766 F.2d 962, 966 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 106 S. Ct. 351 (1985).

The more difficult question is whether Crooks and Holmes dealt with the judge in his judicial, as opposed to some other, capacity. Some have suggested that there is a fairly clear line between acts done in a judge's judicial capacity and acts done in his executive or administrative capacity. *See Forrester v. White*, 792 F.2d 647, 663 (7th Cir. 1986) (Posner, J., dissenting), *cert. granted*, 107 S. Ct. 1282 (1987). Those falling on the administrative line are undeserving of absolute immunity, it is argued. The problem with this distinction is not that it cannot be drawn but that it ignores the reality of present day judging. Virtually all judges, state and federal, are required to perform duties not involving sitting on the bench or preparing orders, legal memoranda, and opinions. The presence of staff personnel and the frequently large numbers of judges that serve on a single trial or appellate court generate duties and activities that can be described as administrative or executive in character but which are essential to the functioning of the court. While many of these are discharged by the chief or presiding judge, many are also borne by rank and file judges. Obviously there are activities that under no circumstances can be deemed to be judicial, e.g., arranging the court's spring party. However, direction of a court's staff in a manner designed to improve overall judicial performance frequently is as important as remaining on the bench longer hours, in-chambers conferencing with attorneys, or producing more and better opinions. If the purpose of absolute immunity is, as Judge Posner suggests in his dissent in *Forrester*, to protect judges "from being seriously deflected from the effective performance of their duties," *id.* at 660, it must be recognized that today's judge administers as he judges and that the sharp line that can be drawn between a judicial act, such as ruling on the admission of evidence, and

managing court or chambers personnel, is useless in fixing th limits of judicial immunity.

[4] In any event, Judge Maynard acted in a judicial capacit when he entered and sought to enforce an order that, whil directed at what might be perceived to be an administrativ problem, was within his power to enter. His act was a judicia act even though many judges would not have exercised thei judicial powers as did he.[4]

B. *Clear Absence of All Jurisdiction*

The Supreme Court in *Stump* employed a broad definitio of the term "jurisdiction" in applying the second part of it two part test. *See* 435 U.S. at 356-57; *accord Ashelman*, 79 F.2d at 1076 ("Jurisdiction should be broadly construed t effectuate the policies supporting immunity."). The Cou employed the distinction drawn in *Bradley v. Fisher*, 80 U.S (13 Wall.) 335 (1872), between acts "in excess of jurisdiction (criminal court judge convicts plaintiff for a nonexister crime) and acts "in clear absence of all jurisdiction" (probat judge tries a criminal case). *Id.* at 351-52. Judicial immunit is pierced only in the latter class of cases. A judge, the Cou repeated, is not acting in the "clear absence of jurisdiction when "the action he took was in error, was done maliciousl or was in excess of his authority." *Stump*, 435 U.S. at 356. H

[4]The plaintiffs argue that Judge Maynard "acted out of personal motiv tion and used his judicial office as an offensive weapon to vindicate pe sonal objectives." Appellant's Brief at 20. The plaintiffs' focus on tl judge's intentions is misplaced. Evil intent or motive does not transform judicial act into a nonjudicial one. *O'Neil v. City of Lake Oswego*, 642 F.2 367, 370 (9th Cir. 1981). In *Harper v. Merckle*, 638 F.2d 848 (5th Cir.), *ce denied*, 454 U.S. 816 (1981), the Fifth Circuit relied on the improp motives of the judge to find that the judge's actions were nonjudicial. *Id.* 859. However, the Fifth Circuit in a later case noted that *Harper*, "by i own terms, is virtually without precedential value," and criticized *Harpe* reliance on intent. *Adams v. McIlhany*, 764 F.2d 294, 298 n.4 (5th Ci 1985), *cert. denied*, 106 S. Ct. 883 (1986).

retains his immunity "even if his exercise of authority is flawed by the commission of grave procedural errors." *Id.* at 359.

Crooks and Holmes contend that Judge Maynard acted in clear absence of all jurisdiction when he held them in contempt for failing to obey his lawful administrative order. They argue that a judge, acting in his role as an administrative judge,[5] has no power to enforce his administrative orders with a judicial contempt order. Enough has already been said to indicate our reservations about such an approach. However, to resolve the "clear absence of all jurisdiction" issue, we turn first to statutory grants of authority.

[5] Idaho Code § 1-1603 provides that "[e]very court has power: . . . [t]o compel obedience to its . . . orders." Section 7-603 of the Idaho Code states that "[w]hen a contempt is committed in the immediate view and presence of the court . . . it may be punished summarily." Section 7-601 defines as contempts of the authority of the court: (3) "Misbehavior in office or other wilful neglect or violation of duty by . . . [a] clerk . . . or other person appointed or elected to perform a judicial or ministerial service" and (5) "Disobedience of any lawful judgment, order or process of the court."

The district court held that Idaho Code § 7-601(3) provided sufficient authority for Judge Maynard's actions. The court characterized the plaintiffs' failure to comply with the administrative order as falling within the broad category of "misbehavior in office" (Crooks as the clerk and Holmes as another person appointed to perform ministerial service) subject to summary contempt.

[5]Idaho Code § 1-907, delineating powers and duties of an administrative judge, does not mention a contempt power. However, that section explicitly provides that the powers of an administrative judge are not limited to those described therein.

[6] We are reluctant to find that Judge Maynard's contempt order was squarely authorized by § 7-601(3) because we do not believe Holmes falls within the category of "appointed or elected" persons. However, Title 7, chapter 6 of the Idaho Code does not circumscribe the judicial contempt power; it merely provides statutory guidance. *Marks v. Vehlow*, 105 Idaho 560, 566, 671 P.2d 473, 479 (Idaho 1983). Idaho judges have an inherent common law contempt power, and Idaho Code § 1-1603 recognizes this broad power. *Id.* In Idaho Code §§ 7-601(3) and (5) the legislature has demonstrated its concern for giving courts power to enforce their lawful orders and to control behavior by court personnel who play an integral role in the judicial process. The statutory framework strongly suggests that Judge Maynard did not act in clear absence of all jurisdiction.

[7] The Idaho Supreme Court has "recognize[d] that the function of the court may be jeopardized should a clerk hire or appoint an incompetent, unqualified, irresponsible or untrusty person as a deputy to perform court-related duties." *Crooks*, 732 P.2d at 287. An administrative judge must have the power to enforce his decisions with respect to court-related personnel to prevent severe impairment of "the smooth, efficient and proper operation of the court system itself," *id.* Thus the administrative and judicial roles of the administrative district judge in Idaho are inextricably interwined. A judge using his judicial contempt power as a means of enforcing an administrative order aimed at ensuring effectiveness in the operation of the district court, while perhaps not acting wisely, is not acting in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.

We recognize that some courts have held that a judge is not immune from liability in connection with the hiring and firing of court personnel. *See McMillan v. Svetanoff*, 793 F.2d 149 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 107 S. Ct. 574 (1986); *Laskowski v. Mears*, 600 F. Supp. 1568 (N.D. Ind. 1985). Courts have stated that the "[h]iring and firing of employees is typically an

administrative task," *McMillan*, 793 F.2d at 155, and that these "personnel decisions are separate from the jurisdiction, power and authority of the court," *Laskowski*, 600 F. Supp. at 1573. Our reservations with respect to the approach of these cases have already been stated. In any event, the issuance of a contempt order is an inherent judicial function, and is expressly authorized by the Idaho legislature as a means of addressing violations of court orders and misbehavior by court personnel. In violating the lawful administrative order the plaintiffs here were dealing with Judge Maynard in his judicial capacity, and he was not acting "in clear absence of all jurisdiction."

AFFIRMED.

PRINTED FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE—U.S. COURTS
BY BARCLAYS / ELECTROGRAPHIC—SAN FRANCISCO—(415) 588-1155

The summary, which does not constitute a part of the opinion of the court, is copyrighted © 1987 by Barclays Law Publishers.